

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-29 and 31-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Dessiatnikov, Dmitry “Securing SZL Connection String”(GIAC Security Essentials Certification Practical Assignment – version 1.4b Option 1 SANS Institute January 8, 2004) (*Dessiatnikov*). Claims 2-4, 6, 9-11, 19, 21-22, 24, 26, 32-33, 37-38 and 40-41 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicant submits claims 1, 5, 7-8, 12-18, 20, 23, 25, 27-29, 31, 34-36, 39 and 42-43 are not anticipated *Dessiatnikov* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

- requesting database connection information from a web application server to a database;
- accessing a key phrase from a file system of the web application server responsive to the request for the connection information;
- combining a system identifier of the web application server with the key phrase to obtain an effective encryption key;
- obtaining a name/value string from a secure storage file in a global directory via a find operation;
- parsing the name/value string into a name string and a value string;
- and
- decrypting the value string with the effective encryption key to obtain the database connection information.

Independent claims 31, 36 and 39 recite similar limitations. The Office action cites *Dessiatnikov* as disclosing the limitations of claim 1. However, *Dessiatnikov* does not disclose several limitations of claim 1, as amended. For example *Dessatnikov* does not disclose combining a system identifier of a web application server with the key

phrase to obtain an effective encryption key. Thus, *Dessiatnikov* fails to anticipate claims 1, 31, 36 and 39.

Claims 5, 7-8 and 12-17 depend from claim 1. Claims 34-35 depend from claim 31. Claims 42-43 depend from claim 39. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 5, 7-8, 12-17, 34-35 and 42-43 are not anticipated by *Dessiatnikov* for at least the same reasons claims 1, 31, 36 and 39 are not anticipated.

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites, in part, a web application server to access a key phrase from a filesystem of the web application server responsive to a request to connect with a database, wherein the web application server includes a system identifier to identify the application server and the key phrase is to be combined with the system identifier. *Dessiatnikov* does not discuss or disclose combining the key phrase with the web application server system identifier. Thus, *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits *Dessiatnikov* fails to anticipate claim 18.

Claims 20, 23, 25 and 27-29 depend from claim 18. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 20, 23, 25 and 27-29 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons claim 18 is not anticipated.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being obvious in view of *Dessiatnikov* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2003/0105977 to

Brabson et al. (*Brabson*). Claim 30 depends from claim 18 and necessarily includes the limitations of the independent claim. As discussed above *Dessiatnikov* fails to disclose combining the key phrase with the web application server system identifier. *Brabson* is cited as disclosing a directory that transitions from storing unencrypted to storing encrypted data. Whether or not *Brabson* discloses the limitations cited in the Office action, which Applicant does not concede, *Brabson* does not disclose combining the key phrase with the web application server system identifier. Thus, *Brabson* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Dessiatnikov*. Accordingly, Applicant submits claim 30 is not obvious in view *Dessiatnikov* and *Brabson*.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: January 24, 2008

/Jared S. Engstrom/
Jared S. Engstrom
Reg. No. 58,330
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: 1/24/2008

/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings